



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/342,719

06/29/1999

DONALD C. ROE

7590Q

6995

27752 7590 09/25/2009
THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY
Global Legal Department - IP
Sycamore Building - 4th Floor
299 East Sixth Street
CINCINNATI, OH 45202

EXAMINER

ANDERSON, CATHARINE L

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3761

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

09/25/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

DETAILED ACTION

Terminal Disclaimer

1. The terminal disclaimer does not comply with 37 CFR 1.321(b) and/or (c) because:
2. An attorney or agent, not of record, is not authorized to sign a terminal disclaimer in the capacity as an attorney or agent acting in a representative capacity as provided by 37 CFR 1.34 (a). See 37 CFR 1.321(b) and/or (c).

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 14 July 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
4. In response to the applicant's argument that Mahgerefteh does not disclose an actuator within the diaper, it is noted that Mahgerefteh discloses an electrical device that controls an alarm, and therefore comprises an actuator. It is further noted that Mahgerefteh is not relied upon for teaching the claimed responsive system, since that is disclosed by Hashimoto. Mahgerefteh is rather relied upon for the teaching of locating a responsive system inside the diaper.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 3761

6. Claims 28-32, 58, and 64-66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hashimoto et al. (5,681,297) in view of Mahgerefteh et al. (5,570,082).

7. Hashimoto discloses all aspects of the claimed invention with the exception of the waste contamination area and mass values, and the responsive system being located between the diaper backsheet and the wearer. Hashimoto discloses a disposable article, as shown in figure 8, comprising a responsive system including a sensor 109 that detects an input when fecal waste is excreted and an actuator 108b that delivers a composition when the sensor detects an input, as disclosed in column 3, lines 42-60. Hashimoto further discloses a method of enhancing removability of waste by providing and using the article, as disclosed in column 2, lines 1-12. The composition is stored within, and in contact with, the diaper during the washing of the wearer of the diaper. The diaper comprises a topsheet 122 and leg cuffs 121a, as shown in figures 5 and 7, which contact the composition during the process of washing, as disclosed in column 3, lines 36-40, and therefore hold the composition storage.

8. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to provide the composition of Hashimoto with a Waste Contamination Area of less than 15 cm² and a Waste Contamination Mass of less than 14 mass units, since it has been held that where the general conditions of the claim are disclosed in the prior art (i.e. the desire to enhance the removability of and to remove fecal waste), finding the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233.

Art Unit: 3761

9. Mahgerefteh teaches a diaper having a responsive system comprising a sensor and actuator located within the diaper, as shown in figure 1. Providing the responsive system within the diaper as opposed to outside of the diaper results in a more cost-effective system, as disclosed in column 1, lines 32-43. It would therefore be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to provide the article of Hashimoto with a responsive system that is located within the diaper, as taught by Mahgerefteh, to provide a more cost-effective system.

10. Claims 34-37, 40-44, 47-48, and 59-60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hashimoto et al. (5,681,297) in view of Mahgerefteh et al. (5,570,082), and further in view of Jones et al. (5,482,714).

11. Hashimoto, as modified by Mahgerefteh, discloses all aspects of the claimed invention with the exception of the composition comprising a feces modifying agent, a skin care composition, and a thickener. The composition of Hashimoto is provided to cleanse fecal waste from the wearer of the article, as disclosed in column 3, lines 54-60.

12. Jones teaches a composition for cleansing skin that has contacted fecal waste, the composition comprising a silicone oil (see column 4, lines 35-44), Al_2O_3 (see column 3, line 26), and a thickener (see column 3, lines 13-14). The composition provides a skin care benefit and protects the skin from irritation caused by fecal waste, as disclosed in column 1, lines 49-56.

Art Unit: 3761

13. It would therefore be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include a skin care composition in the cleansing composition of Hashimoto, as taught by Jones, to protect the skin from irritation by fecal waste.

Double Patenting

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the “right to exclude” granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 28 and 58 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 20 of U.S. Patent No. 6,093,869.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because optimization of the Waste Containment Area and Mass would be obvious.

3. Claims 28 and 58 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 15 of U.S. Patent No. 6,186,991.

Art Unit: 3761

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because optimization of the Waste Containment Area and Mass would be obvious.

4. Claims 28 and 58 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 11 of U.S. Patent No. 6,384,296.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because optimization of the Waste Containment Area and Mass would be obvious.

5. Claims 28, 34, 42, 44, and 58 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 12, and 14 of U.S. Patent No. 6,395,955. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because optimization of the Waste Containment Area and Mass would be obvious.

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 3761

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lynne Anderson whose telephone number is (571)272-4932. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tanya Zalukaeva can be reached on (571) 272-1115. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Tatyana Zalukaeva/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art
Unit 3761

/L. A./
Examiner, Art Unit 3761